



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/053,040	04/01/1998	ISAO KUDO	KANHA3111.01	9807
26694 7.	590 12/18/2003	,	EXAMINER	
VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP			FRECH, KARL D	
P.O. BOX 3438	35 N, DC 20043-9998		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
WASIMAGIO	11, DC 20013 7770		2876	

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	j
Advisory Action	09/053,040	KUDO, ISAO	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Karl D Frech	2876	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	I to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendme ppeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply nt which places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FO	OR REPLY [check either a) or b	p)]	
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing	ng date of the final rejection.		•
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply of ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a)	expire later than SIX MONTHS from the Y WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH	ne mailing date of the final rejections SOF THE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the p fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration d (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	eriod of extension and the correspond late of the shortened statutory period ne Office later than three months after	ding amount of the fee. The appr for reply originally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appel 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3)			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter	red because:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see N	lote below);	` ,	
(c) they are not deemed to place the applica issues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without ca	anceling a corresponding numl	ber of finally rejected claims	S.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) we canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	vould be allowable if submitted	l in a separate, timely filed	amendment
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ reque application in condition for allowance because		n considered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed SO	LELY to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended clair			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_•		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)		ed by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stat	tement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
10. Other:	,,, , , , ,		

Karl D Frech Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2876

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation She t (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: applicant proposes to amend into claims 1 and 11 an element as seen in claims 3 and 13 respectively. However, the manner in which this is done creates a new consideration. As of the final rejection, the element of claim 3, for example, claims that "said ID chip information is projected and exposed using a liquid crystal mask that is capable of changing a light transmitting pattern for each exposure." As proposed claim 1, for example, now claims that a code pattern is provided "directly on a surface" of a semiconductor chip "by projection and exposure". The finally rejected claims did not call for the ID information being provided on the surface of the chip by projection and exposure. Although the difference may be slight, it is sufficient to require further search.